

Claims 25 and 26 are merely claims which claim the substrate (article) having been treated by the invention.

Claim 29 points out that the substrate (article) is wood.

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

The meaning of the last 5 lines of claim 1 is clear. That satisfies the Section 112 claiming requirement. The examiner's objection to Claim 31 is not understood. Claim 31 meets claiming requirement of Section 112.

The above amendments overcome and avoid the objections raised on pages 1-4 of the office action.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on cited art are requested.

Claim 1 has been rejected under Section 102(b) as anticipated by Matsushita. Other claims have been rejected under Section 102(b) as anticipated by Brown, Tennigkeit, Light, Yantai, Dombay and under Section 103 as obvious over Dombay and Bures. Each of the references has been considered independently by the examiner. None of the references have been combined.

The Examiner's citing of Brown and Tennigkeit in this the application belies common sense. Both Brown and Tennigkeit describe dyes for human hair such as dyes commonly sold in drug stores or hair salons. Such dyes are, of course, not from the art to which the present invention pertains. It would be ridiculous to consider going into a drug store or beauty salon to purchase wood stains. By the same token one would not expect that a beauty operator would go to a lumber store or a hardware store to buy stains which he would use for dying human hair.